



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING/RECEIPT DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER
10/081,846	02/25/2002	Bernard A. Nadel	

BERNARD A NADEL
49 REYNOLD'S LANDING
P.O. Box 499
IRVINGTON, VA 22480



CONFIRMATION NO. 3765

FORMALITIES LETTER



OC000000007921467

Date Mailed: 04/22/2002

NOTICE OF INCOMPLETE NONPROVISIONAL APPLICATION

FILED UNDER 37 CFR 1.53(b)

A filing date has NOT been accorded to the above-identified application papers for the reason(s) indicated below.

All the items noted below and a newly executed oath or declaration covering the items must be submitted within **TWO MONTHS** of the date of this Notice, unless otherwise indicated, or proceedings on the application will be terminated (37 CFR 1.53(e)).

The filing date will be the date of receipt of all items required below, unless otherwise indicated. Any assertions that the item(s) required below were submitted, or are not necessary for a filing date, must be by way of petition directed to the attention of the Office of Petitions accompanied by the \$130.00 petition fee (37 CFR 1.17(h)). If the petition states that the application is entitled to a filing date, a request for a refund of the petition fee may be included in the petition.

- The specification does not include at least one claim.
A complete specification as prescribed by 35 U.S.C. 112 is required.

The application is informal since it does not comply with the regulations for the reason(s) indicated below.

The required item(s) identified below must be timely submitted to avoid abandonment:

- An abstract was not provided for this application. An abstract of the technical disclosure is required under 37 CFR 1.72(b).

*A copy of this notice **MUST** be returned with the reply.*

Shirley Germaine
Customer Service Center
Initial Patent Examination Division (703) 308-1202

PART 1 - ATTORNEY/APPLICANT COPY

10/2/02 DAE WASH DC 20231



SECOND REQUEST!!!!!!

04/25/2002

Office of Petitions
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington , DC 20231

RE: Application # 10/081.846

Gentle persons:

Please find enclosed the necessary \$130.00 for resubmission of the original date the above patent application was filed, Feb.28/2002. If granted I will attempt to fulfill the shortcomings of my application. If not, this important boon to Ophthalmology may die on the vine. At 85 years of age, I don't know how much time I have and I am much too tired to fight Alcon and Bausch & Lomb and others who are anxiously awaiting the outcome of this petition .

I have filed 3 Pre Patent Applications at \$75.00 per, the last of which # 60/284,808 would become worthless unless 10/081,846 has a filing date prior to April 19th. I only received rejection today, the April 25th. What took so long? Ergo, because of developments beyond my control, I am placed in a ketch 22 situation. I don't think the petition fee is warranted.

I am living officially retired and I could never afford to pay an attorney \$400.00 an hour, having spent several years and all the money I could muster developing this surgical procedure which would benefit mankind...even, perhaps you, the reader. Can it be that the paperwork involved in a patent is more important than it's creation?

I would appreciate a refund of the \$130.00 in view of the too lateness of the rejection. (I thought it should be \$55.00 for a loner).

This would not be my first patent. In the true spirit of innovation for which our country has become famous, please advise what claims other than those in the original application (see enclosed excerpts) might be viable. Also, enclosed, I have written an abstract limited to 150 words. Please advise if this is satisfactory. I would be more than happy to appear personally. I understand that that would require some sort of pass to get by the Gendarme below.

Help!

Bernard Nadel...Prop



Jewelcraft Die Service

MASTER TOOLMAKERS

Research-Development-Fabrication

P.O. Box 499
IRVINGTON, VA 22480
(804) 438 6656 * ~~(804) 435 0865~~
toolndie@rivnet.net

Ship To:
JEWELCRAFT BLDNG.
113-115 CHESAPEAKE DR.
WHITESTONE VA 22578

Commissioner of Patents

APPLICATION # 10/081,846 May 30/02

James (?) Rogan

RE: Confirmation Letter 3765

When Clinton took office, the first thing he did was sign Nafta and Gatt forcing my company to compete with China. With American ingenuity, with high-speed tooling @ (30,000) parts per hour we eked out a PROFIT of one tenth of a cent per part (\$30.00 per hour.) once the new expensive tooling we built shall have been amortized. I wonder if he was watching, because the next thing he did was put enormous tariffs on steel from Brazil, Spain, and Japan. Now I would LOSE \$30.00 per hour once the expensive tooling shall have been amortized. The steel now cost more than the finished product. This is called saving the steel companies by putting out of business, the people who buy steel.

Three things happened: 1. I dismissed my 17 employees. 2. I started getting auction sale notices from bankrupt tool and die shops averaging 3 a week. 3. I went in to Research and Development.

I am telling you all this to explain why I can no longer afford a patent attorney @ \$400.00/Hr.

In the 40's I invented an automatic press feeder called MICRO SLIDE FEED; more accurate and more dependable than anything then available, one that could compensate for camber. My patent attorney ran into the kind of red tape that I now find myself. I went to Alexandria and met the head of your department and told him how important it was to move ahead on this since we were at war and needed to produce war materielle. He was most helpful. He reworded the document to comply with protocol and the patent was promptly granted. Why cannot you do the same for me? Everything you asked for was in the original patent application. All that was lacking was protocol. I hope you are not one of those who think that nothing should ever happen for the first time.

It is absolutely tantamount that the date of my patent application is not denied. This is the only thing that stops me from demonstrating my prototype to Bausch & Lomb who is waiting to see it. There are others too. Your department is impeding progress after 3 years of hard work. While you and I dither over protocol, thousands are suffering needlessly, the after effects of botched eye operations.

I really don't have time for protocol. Although this invention which makes present methods of extracting a cataractous lens from the eye and replacing it with a man made one obsolete is important, there are 2 other inventions of greater importance in the pipeline, especially since we are again at war.

I hereby declare that my CLAIMS and ABSTRACT hereby submitted as requested on separate sheets are strictly my own as are all the items on my original pre patent and patent applications and that I and I alone am the inventor of The Furler and Injector.

Bernard A Nadel

Lost ground can be regained...Lost time, never. "Franklin Delano Roosevelt"